



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/035,788      | 12/24/2001  | Bill J. Peck         | 10010409-1          | 3882             |

7590 11/17/2005  
AFILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Legal Department, DL429  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 7599  
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

EXAMINER

LEUNG, JENNIFER A

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1764

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/035,788

Applicant(s)

PECK, BILL J.

Examiner

Jennifer A. Leung

Art Unit

1764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 40-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 40-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment submitted on August 29, 2005 has been received and carefully considered. The drawings are acceptable. Claims 22-39 are cancelled. Claims 40-62 are newly added. Claims 1-21 and 40-62 are currently active.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 55 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 55, it is unclear as to where the limitation, "each of said compartments has vertical symmetry," is located in the specification and drawings. It is unclear as to whether applicants intended to recite, --said chamber has vertical symmetry--.

Regarding claim 59, it is unclear as to where the limitation, "a plurality of dispensing nodules that protrude into said chamber," is located in the specification and drawings. It is unclear as to whether applicants intended to recite, --a plurality of dispensing nozzles that protrude into said chamber--.

Art Unit: 1764

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear as to the structural limitation applicant is attempting to recite by, "said gas inlets are oriented with respect to said respective compartments of said manifold such that gas enters said respective compartments in a direction that is substantially normal to the direction in which gas exits said manifold." This limitation appears to contradict claim 1, which recites, "a manifold comprising at least two compartments, each of said compartments being in fluid communication with a respective gas inlet... said perforated element being substantially perpendicular to said gas inlets." This limitation also appears to contradict the specification and drawings. As seen in FIG. 2, the perforated element 116 is substantially perpendicular to the gas inlets 102a-102e. The gas inlets 102a-102e are oriented with respect to their respective compartments 112a-112e of the manifold 110 such that gas enters each compartment 102a-102e in a direction that is the same direction in which gas exits the manifold 110.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-20 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagener et al. (US 6,251,195) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888).

Regarding claim 1, Wagener et al. (FIG. 1; column 5, line 39 to column 7, line 64)

Art Unit: 1764

discloses an apparatus comprising a chamber (i.e., process chamber 12) comprising an opening (i.e., chamber valve 28) in a wall; a device (i.e., nozzle 20) dispensing reagents on a support (i.e., wafer 18), at least a portion of device 20 being within chamber 12; and a mechanism (i.e., transfer robot 50) moving support 18 into and out of chamber 12 through opening 28 and for positioning support 18 relative to device 20. Wagener et al. (column 9, line 22 to column 10, line 28) further discloses an element (i.e., diffuser 32) diffusing gas within compartment 12, wherein, “diffuser 32 is used to create... an evenly distributed flow 30 of gas, referred to as a “curtain flow” of gas,” (column 9, lines 48-50). Wagener et al., however, is silent as to diffuser 32 comprising a manifold including at least two compartments, wherein each compartment is in fluid communication with a respective gas inlet and wherein a perforated element is in fluid communication with said manifold and substantially perpendicular to the gas inlets.

Sharma et al. (FIG. 1; column 3, line 57 to column 5, line 40) teaches an apparatus for dispersing a multi-layer fluid curtain, the apparatus comprising a manifold including at least two compartments (i.e., a dual diffuser comprising a first compartment defined by inner diffuser 16 and a second compartment defined by outer diffuser 22), wherein each of compartments 16 and 22 is in fluid communication with a respective gas inlet 18 and 24; a perforated element is in fluid communication with said manifold (i.e., each of emitting areas 20 and 26 comprising an “opening covered by a porous, permeable or perforated surface,” column 4, lines 17-33 and 47-66); and the perforated element is substantially perpendicular to the gas inlets 18 and 24 (i.e., emitting area 26 is perpendicular to inlet 24 in FIG. 1; also, emitting area 20 may be, “oriented to emit the inner layer of fluid parallel to the furnace opening 10,” thereby suggesting that the element may also be configured perpendicular to the gas inlet 18; column 4, lines 34-40).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the apparatus for dispersing gas of Sharma et al. for the diffuser **32** in the apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the fluid curtain as emitted by the apparatus of Sharma et al. possesses two layers that act cooperatively to stabilize the laminar flow in each layer over a longer distance, thereby extending the effective area of coverage of the layers (column 2, lines 41-50). Also, the substitution of known equivalent structures involves only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fout* 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982); *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); *In re Siebentritt* 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967); *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, the collective teaching of Wagener et al. and Sharma et al. is silent as to the perforated element comprising about 5 to about 200 perforation per square inch, about a 0.02 to about a 0.2 inch thickness, and perforation diameters of about 0.03 to about 0.25 inches. In any event, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an appropriate number of perforations, thickness, and perforation diameter for the perforated element in the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use and absent showing any unexpected results thereof, because where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art, *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claim 5, Wagener et al. discloses, “[d]iffuser **32** can be positioned in a number of locations within chamber **12** as may be desired for a particular application. In addition, diffuser **32** may be adjustably mounted within the chamber **12**.” (column 6, lines 31-37). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 1764

to locate the perforated element opposite the opening **28** in the modified apparatus of Wegner et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use. The shifting of location of parts merely involves routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 7 and 40, device **20** for dispensing reagents **24** is a drop dispensing device (i.e., device **20** supplies an aerosol spray; column 5, lines 39-67), and mechanism **50** moves support **18** relative to drop dispensing device **20** (column 6, line 64 to column 7, line 24). The device **20** also comprises a pulse jet device, since the device is capable of supplying a jet of cryogenic particles. In any event, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a known, suitable dispensing device for the device **20** in the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because "... the design of such nozzles and other devices and controlling techniques are known... Any known or developed nozzle, supply or controlling circuits and mechanisms can be utilized in accordance with the process chamber of the present invention." (column 5, lines 58-67). The Examiner takes Official Notice that the instantly claimed dispensing devices are conventionally known in the art.

Regarding claim 8, although the collective teaching of Wagener and Sharma is silent as to the instantly claimed orientation of the gas inlets, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an appropriate orientation for the gas inlets in the modified apparatus of Wagener, on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the shifting of location of parts merely involves routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 9, 18 and 19, Sharma et al. teaches three or more diffusers may be stacked to issue a curtain of three or more layers (column 2, lines 60-63; column 5, lines 32-35).

Art Unit: 1764

Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide at least four compartments in the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use (e.g., for issuing a curtain of four or more layers). In addition, the duplication of part was held to have been obvious. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Beemis Co. Inc.* 193 USPQ 8, 11 (1977); *In re Harza* 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). In the case of the apparatus having at least four compartments, the apparatus would thus comprise at least four gas inlets (i.e., similar to gas inlets **18** and **24**; see FIG. 1), wherein each of said gas inlets comprises a valve (i.e., similar to the means **19** and **25** for controlling the fluid flow; see FIG. 1).

Regarding claim 10, the chamber **12** of Wagener has a vertical symmetry (see FIG. 1).

Regarding claims 12 and 13, Wagener et al. (FIG. 1; column 6, line 64 to column 7, line 24) discloses a controller for controlling the movement of mechanism **50** for moving support **18** (i.e., the “robot” will comprise control means, for controlling the disclosed X-Y directional movements or Z-direction movement), wherein said mechanism **50** is a robotic arm (see FIG. 3).

Regarding claims 14 and 15, Wagener (FIG. 1-4; column 8, lines 51-65) discloses opening **28** comprises a door (i.e., closed in FIG. 2,4; open in FIG. 3), wherein the dimensions of said door are sufficient to permit ingress and egress of a mechanism **50** (see FIG. 3).

Regarding claim 16, although Wagener (FIG. 1) is silent as to the dimensions of door **28** being sufficient to permit ingress and egress of device **20**, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select appropriate dimensions for said door **28** in the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use thereof, because it has been held that changes in size involve only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 463, 105 USPQ 237, 240 (CCPA 1955).



Regarding claim 17, door **28** is in a wall of chamber **12** opposite to an outlet element (i.e., an opening for evacuating chamber **12** with pump **40**; column 6, lines 47-63; FIG. 1).

Regarding claim 20, it appears that the modified apparatus of Wagener structurally meets the claims, as the pressure at which the gas is introduced through the manifold is considered a process limitation, and the structural design of the gas inlets appears no different from the gas inlets as disclosed by Applicants. Thus, the gas inlets in the modified apparatus of Wagener would be inherently capable of supplying the gas at the desired pressure.

5. Claims 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagener et al. (US 6,251,195) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Vogel (US 5,590,537).

The collective teaching of Wagener and Sharma is silent as to the perforated element being about 0.02 to about 2 inches thick. In any event, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the claimed thickness for the perforated element in the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use and absent showing any unexpected results thereof, because it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art, *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. Also, changes in size merely involves ordinary skill in the art. In addition, the collective teaching of Wagener et al. and Sharma et al. is silent as to the apparatus comprising a honeycomb element in fluid communication with said perforated element. Vogel (column 3, lines 20-42; FIG. 1) teaches an apparatus for dispersing a gas as a fluid curtain, said apparatus comprising a honeycomb element **30**. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 1764

made to provide the honeycomb element of Vogel to the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the honeycomb element ensures that the fluid curtain flows in a laminar and parallel fashion, as taught by Vogel.

6. Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagener et al. (US 6,251,195) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Yamamoto (JP 63-296845).

Wagener is silent as to the walls of chamber 12 leading to the wall with opening 28 being tapered, or the angles in the interior of chamber 12 being beveled. Yamamoto (FIG. 4, third illustration) teaches a chamber comprising a tapered wall 14 leading to a wall comprising an opening 13, the tapered wall 14 defining a beveled angle. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide tapered walls or beveled angles in the chamber of the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the tapered walls or beveled angles guide the flow of fluid from the interior of the chamber to the chamber outlet, as evidenced by Yamamoto.

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagener et al. (US 6,251,195) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Philipossian (US 5,064,367).

The collective teaching of Wagener and Sharma is silent as to each compartment comprising an element for diffusing gas within the compartment. Philipossian (FIG. 9, 10; column 5, line 5 to column 6, line 25) teaches a compartment (i.e., tube 10) comprising a diffusing element (i.e., as defined by filler 45, or insert 46). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a diffusing element

Art Unit: 1764

within the compartments in the modified apparatus of Wagener, on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the diffusing elements produce a conical nozzle that supplies a gas flow at faster velocities, following the flow streamlines, and avoids or minimizes recirculating gas cells. The amount of gas used in purging a tube with this configuration is reduced, and the time need for thorough purging is also reduced,” as taught by Philpossian (Abstract).

8. Claims 41, 43, 45-48 and 50-52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagener et al. (US 6,251,195) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888) and Powers (US 5,965,048).

Regarding claim 41, Wagener (FIG. 1; column 5, line 39 to column 7, line 64) discloses an apparatus comprising a chamber (i.e., process chamber 12) comprising an opening (i.e., chamber valve 28) in a wall; a device (i.e., nozzle 20) dispensing reagents on a support (i.e., wafer 18), at least a portion of device 20 being within chamber 12; and a mechanism (i.e., transfer robot 50) moving support 18 into and out of chamber 12 through opening 28 and positioning support 18 relative to device 20. Wagener (column 9, line 22 to column 10, line 28) further discloses an element (i.e., diffuser 32) for diffusing gas within said compartment 12, wherein the “diffuser 32 is used to create... an evenly distributed flow 30 of gas, referred to as a “curtain flow” of gas,” (column 9, lines 48-50). Wagener, however, is silent as to diffuser 32 comprising a manifold including at least two compartments, wherein each compartment is in fluid communication with a respective gas inlet, and a perforated element is in fluid communication with said manifold.

Sharma et al. (FIG. 1; column 3, line 57 to column 5, line 40) teaches an apparatus for dispersing a multi-layer fluid curtain, the apparatus comprising a manifold including at least two

Art Unit: 1764

compartments (i.e., a dual diffuser comprising a first compartment defined by inner diffuser **16** and a second compartment defined by outer diffuser **22**), wherein each of compartments **16** and **22** is in fluid communication with a respective gas inlet **18** and **24**, and a perforated element is in fluid communication with said manifold (i.e., emitting areas **20** and **26** comprise an “opening covered by a porous, permeable or perforated surface,” column 4, lines 17-33 and 47-66).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the apparatus for dispersing gas of Sharma et al. for the diffuser **32** in the apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the fluid curtain as emitted by the apparatus of Sharma et al. possesses two layers that act cooperatively to stabilize the laminar flow in each layer over a longer distance, thereby extending the effective area of coverage of the layers (column 2, lines 41-50). Also, the substitution of known equivalent structures involves only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fout* 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982); *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); *In re Siebentritt* 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967); *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

The collective teachings of Wagener et al. and Sharma et al. is silent as to each gas inlet being in fluid communication with a gas inlet source that is oriented to provide gas in a direction that is substantially normal to the direction in which the gas flows through the gas inlet and enters the manifold. Powers teaches an apparatus comprising plural gas inlets (i.e., openings **64**; see FIG. 5), wherein each gas inlet **64** is in fluid communication with a gas inlet source that is oriented to provide gas in a direction that is substantially normal to the direction in which the gas flows through the gas inlet and into the diffuser (i.e., via conduit **44**, which directs the gas flow in a direction normal to the flow of gas through gas inlets **64**; see FIG. 2). It would have been

Art Unit: 1764

obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the gas inlets as instantly claimed because the configuration allows plural gas inlets to be fed by a single gas source, as taught by Powers.

Regarding claim 43, Wagener et al. discloses that, “[d]iffuser 32 can be positioned in a number of locations within chamber 12 as may be desired for a particular application. In addition, diffuser 32 may be adjustably mounted within the chamber 12.” (column 6, lines 31-37). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate the perforated element opposite the opening 28 in the modified apparatus of Wegner et al. on the basis of suitability for the intended use. Furthermore, it has been held that the shifting of location of parts merely involves routine skill in the art.

Regarding claims 45-47, Wagener et al. discloses said device 20 for dispensing reagents 24 is a drop dispensing device (i.e., device 20 supplies a cryogenic aerosol spray; column 5, lines 39-67), and said mechanism 50 is a mechanism for moving a support 18 relative to said drop dispensing device 20 (column 6, line 64 to column 7, line 24). The device 20 also comprises a pulse jet device, since the device is capable of supplying a jet of frozen cryogenic particles. In any event, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a known, suitable dispensing device for the device 20 in the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because “... the design of such nozzles and other devices and controlling techniques are known... Any known or developed nozzle, supply or controlling circuits and mechanisms can be utilized in accordance with the process chamber of the present invention.” (column 5, lines 58-67). The Examiner takes Official Notice that the instantly claimed dispensing devices are conventionally known in the art.

Regarding claim 48, the chamber **12** of Wagener has a vertical symmetry (see FIG. 1).

Regarding claim 50, Wagener et al. (FIG. 1; column 6, line 64 to column 7, line 24) further discloses a controller for controlling the movement of said mechanism **50** for moving said support **18** (by definition, a “robot” will comprise some sort of control means; e.g., for controlling the disclosed X-Y directional movements or Z-direction movement), wherein said mechanism **50** is a robotic arm (see FIG. 3).

Regarding claim 51, Wagener et al. (FIG. 1-4; column 8, lines 51-65) discloses opening **28** comprises a door (i.e., door closed in FIG. 2, 4; door open in FIG. 3), wherein the dimensions of said door are sufficient to permit ingress and egress of mechanism **50** (see FIG. 3).

Regarding claim 52, Wagener et al. discloses that, “[d]iffuser **32** can be positioned in a number of locations within chamber **12** as may be desired for a particular application. In addition, diffuser **32** may be adjustably mounted within the chamber **12**.” (column 6, lines 31-37). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate the perforated element opposite the opening **28** in the modified apparatus of Wegner et al. on the basis of suitability for the intended use. Furthermore, it has been held that the shifting of location of parts merely involves routine skill in the art.

9. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagener et al. (US 6,251,195) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888) and Powers (US 5,965,048), as applied to claim 41 above, and further in view of Vogel (US 5,590,537).

The collective teaching of Wagener, Sharma and Powers is silent as to the apparatus comprising a honeycomb element in fluid communication with said perforated element. Vogel (column 3, lines 20-42; FIG. 1) teaches an apparatus for dispersing a fluid curtain, comprising a

Art Unit: 1764

honeycomb element **30**. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the honeycomb element of Vogel to the modified apparatus of Wagener, on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the honeycomb element ensures that the fluid curtain flows in a laminar and parallel fashion, as taught by Vogel.

10. Claims 44 and 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagener et al. (US 6,251,195) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888) and Powers (US 5,965,048), as applied to claims 41 and 43 above, and further in view of Yamamoto (JP 63-296845).

Wagener is silent as to the walls of chamber **12** leading to opening **28** being tapered, or the angles in the interior being beveled. Yamamoto (FIG. 4, third illustration) teaches a chamber comprising a tapered wall **14** leading to a wall comprising an opening **13**, the tapered wall **14** defining a beveled angle in the interior of said chamber. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide tapered walls or beveled angles in the chamber of the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the tapered walls or beveled angles would help guide the flow of fluid from the interior of the chamber to the chamber outlet, as evidenced by Yamamoto.

11. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagener et al. (US 6,251,195) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888) and Powers (US 5,965,048), as applied to claim 41 above, and further in view of Philipossian (US 5,064,367).

The collective teaching of Wagener, Sharma and Powers is silent as to each compartment comprising an element for diffusing gas within the compartment. Philipossian (FIG. 9, 10; column 5, line 5 to column 6, line 25) teaches a compartment (i.e., tube **10**) comprising a diffusing element (i.e., as defined by filler **45**, or insert **46**). It would have been obvious for one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a diffusing element within the compartments in the modified apparatus of Wagener, on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the diffusing elements produce a conical nozzle that supplies a gas flow at faster velocities, following the flow streamlines, and avoids or minimizes recirculating gas cells. The amount of gas used in purging a tube with this configuration is reduced, and the time need for thorough purging is also reduced,” as taught by Philipossian (Abstract).

12. Claims 54, 55 and 57-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagener et al. (US 6,251,195) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888) and Philipossian (US 5,064,367).

Regarding claim 54, Wagener FIG. 1; column 5, line 39 to column 7, line 64) discloses an apparatus comprising a chamber (i.e., process chamber 12) comprising an opening (i.e., chamber valve 28) in a wall; a device (i.e., nozzle 20) dispensing reagents on a support (i.e., wafer 18), at least a portion of device 20 being within chamber 12; and a mechanism (i.e., transfer robot 50) moving support 18 into and out of chamber 12 through opening 28 and positioning support 18 relative to device 20. Wagener (column 9, line 22 to column 10, line 28) further discloses an element (i.e., diffuser 32) for diffusing gas within said compartment 12, wherein the “diffuser 32 is used to create... an evenly distributed flow 30 of gas, referred to as a “curtain flow” of gas,” (column 9, lines 48-50).

Wagener is silent as to diffuser 32 comprising a manifold including at least two compartments, wherein each compartment is in fluid communication with a respective gas inlet, and wherein a perforated element is in fluid communication with said manifold. Sharma et al. (FIG. 1; column 3, line 57 to column 5, line 40) teaches an apparatus for dispersing a multi-layer



Art Unit: 1764

fluid curtain, the apparatus comprising a manifold including at least two compartments (i.e., a dual diffuser comprising a first compartment defined by inner diffuser **16** and a second compartment defined by outer diffuser **22**), wherein each of compartments **16** and **22** is in fluid communication with a respective gas inlet **18** and **24**, and a perforated element is in fluid communication with said manifold (i.e., emitting areas **20** and **26** comprising an “opening covered by a porous, permeable or perforated surface,” column 4, lines 17-33 and 47-66). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the apparatus for dispersing gas of Sharma et al. for the diffuser **32** in the apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the fluid curtain as emitted by the apparatus of Sharma et al. possesses two layers that act cooperatively to stabilize the laminar flow in each layer over a longer distance, thereby extending the effective area of coverage of the layers (column 2, lines 41-50). Also, the substitution of known equivalent structures involves only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fout* 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982); *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); *In re Siebentritt* 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967); *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

The collective teaching of Wagener et al. and Sharma et al. is silent as to each of said compartments comprising raised surfaces within the compartments. Philipossian (FIG. 9, 10; column 5, line 5 to column 6, line 25) teaches a compartment (i.e., tube 10) comprising raised surfaces (i.e., as defined by filler **45**, or insert **46**). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide raised surfaces within the compartments in the modified apparatus of Wagener, on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the raised surfaces produce a conical nozzle that supplies a gas flow at faster

Art Unit: 1764

velocities, following the flow streamlines, and avoids or minimizes recirculating gas cells. The amount of gas used in purging a tube with this configuration is reduced, and the time need for thorough purging is also reduced,” as taught by Philipossian (Abstract).

Regarding claim 55, each of the compartments have vertical symmetry (see FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-66 of Sharma).

Regarding claims 57-59, Wagener et al. discloses said device **20** for dispensing reagents **24** is a drop dispensing device (i.e., device **20** supplies a cryogenic aerosol spray; column 5, lines 39-67), and said mechanism **50** is a mechanism for moving a support **18** relative to said drop dispensing device **20** (column 6, line 64 to column 7, line 24). The device **20** also comprises a pulse jet device, since the device is capable of supplying a jet of frozen cryogenic particles. In any event, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a known, suitable dispensing device for the device **20** in the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because “... the design of such nozzles and other devices and controlling techniques are known... Any known or developed nozzle, supply or controlling circuits and mechanisms can be utilized in accordance with the process chamber of the present invention.” (column 5, lines 58-67). The Examiner takes Official Notice that the instantly claimed dispensing devices are conventionally known in the art.

Regarding claim 60, Wagener et al. (FIG. 1; column 6, line 64 to column 7, line 24) further discloses a controller for controlling the movement of said mechanism **50** for moving said support **18** (by definition, a “robot” will comprise some sort of control means; e.g., for controlling the disclosed X-Y directional movements or Z-direction movement), wherein said mechanism **50** is a robotic arm (see FIG. 3).

Regarding claim 61, Wagener et al. discloses that, “[d]iffuser 32 can be positioned in a number of locations within chamber 12 as may be desired for a particular application. In addition, diffuser 32 may be adjustably mounted within the chamber 12.” (column 6, lines 31-37). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to locate the perforated element opposite the opening 28 in the modified apparatus of Wegner et al. on the basis of suitability for the intended use. Furthermore, it has been held that the shifting of location of parts merely involves routine skill in the art.

Regarding claim 62, Sharma et al. teaches that three or more diffusers may be stacked to issue a curtain of three or more layers (column 2, lines 60-63; column 5, lines 32-35). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide at least four compartments to the manifold in the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use (e.g., for issuing a curtain of four or more layers). In addition, the duplication of part was held to have been obvious. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Beemis Co. Inc.* 193 USPQ 8, 11 (1977); *In re Harza* 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).

13. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagener et al. (US 6,251,195) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888) and Philipossian (US 5,064,367), as applied to claim 54 above, and further in view of Vogel (US 5,590,537).

The collective teachings of Wagener, Sharma and Philipossian is silent as to the apparatus comprising a flow-straightening element in fluid communication with the perforated element. Vogel (column 3, lines 20-42; FIG. 1) teaches an apparatus for dispersing a gas as a fluid curtain, said apparatus comprising a flow-straightening element (i.e., honeycomb element 30). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 1764

made to provide the flow-straightening element of Vogel to the modified apparatus of Wagener et al., on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the honeycomb element ensures that the fluid curtain flows in a laminar and parallel fashion, as taught by Vogel.

14. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gamble et al. (US 5,981,733) in view of Sharma et al. (US 5,195,888).

Regarding claim 1, Gamble (FIG. 9, 10, 14; column 8, line 34 to column 10, line 37; column 11, line 62 to column 13, line 63) discloses an apparatus comprising a chamber (i.e., second section **104**; FIG. 9) in fluid communication with said gas outlet port **194**, said chamber **104** comprising an opening in a wall thereof (i.e., a horizontal slot **140**; FIG. 10); a device for dispensing reagents (i.e., jetting system **24**, with jetting device **46**; FIG. 9, 10), at least a portion of said device **46** being within said chamber **104**; and a mechanism (i.e., positioning system **30**, with rotational support rod **106**; column 8, lines 52-59) for moving a support (i.e., substrate **20**) into and out of said chamber **104** through said opening **140** and for positioning the support **20** relative to said device for dispensing reagents **24**. Gamble is silent as to outlet port **194** comprising a manifold including at least two compartments, wherein each of said compartments is in fluid communication with a respective gas inlet, wherein a perforated element in fluid communication with said manifold, and wherein said perforated element is substantially perpendicular to the gas inlets.

Sharma (FIG. 1; column 3, line 57 to column 5, line 40) teaches an apparatus dispersing a multi-layer fluid curtain, the apparatus comprising a manifold including two compartments (i.e., a dual diffuser comprising a first compartment defined by inner diffuser **16** and a second compartment defined by outer diffuser **22**), wherein each of compartments **16** and **22** is in fluid

Art Unit: 1764

communication with a respective gas inlet **18** and **24**, and wherein a perforated element is in fluid communication with said manifold (i.e., emitting areas **20** and **26** comprising an “opening covered by a porous, permeable or perforated surface,” column 4, lines 17-33 and 47-66) and substantially perpendicular to the gas inlets **18** and **24** (i.e., emitting area **26** and its corresponding perforated element is perpendicular to inlet **24** in FIG. 1; also, emitting area **20** and its corresponding perforated element may be, “oriented to emit the inner layer of fluid parallel to the furnace opening **10**,” thereby suggesting that the perforated element may be configured perpendicular to the gas inlet **18**; column 4, lines 34-40).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the apparatus for dispersing gas of Sharma for gas outlet port **194** in the apparatus of Gamble, on the basis of suitability for the intended use, because the fluid curtain as emitted by the apparatus of Sharma et al. possesses two layers that act cooperatively to stabilize the laminar flow in each layer over a longer distance, thereby extending the effective area of coverage of the layers (column 2, lines 41-50). Also, substitution of known equivalent structures involves only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Fout* 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA 1982); *In re Susi* 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971); *In re Siebentritt* 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967); *In re Ruff* 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, the collective teaching of Gamble and Sharma is silent as to the perforated element comprising about 5 to about 200 perforation per square inch, about a 0.02 to about a 0.2 inch thickness, and perforation diameters of about 0.03 to about 0.25 inches. In any event, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select an appropriate number of perforations per square inch, thickness, and

Art Unit: 1764

perforation diameter for the perforated element in the modified apparatus of Gamble, on the basis of suitability for the intended use and absent showing any unexpected results thereof, because where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art, *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Regarding claim 5, in the modified apparatus, opening **140** is in a wall of said chamber **104** opposite to the perforated element (i.e., located at the dry gas outlet port **194**).

Regarding claim 7, Gamble et al. further discloses a drop dispensing device (i.e., a jetting system **24** for dispensing micro-sized spots of reagent; column 3, lines 35-43), and said mechanism (i.e., positioning system **30**, with rotational support rod **106**; column 8, lines 52-59) is a mechanism for moving a support **20** relative to said drop dispensing device **24** (see column 2, lines 14-16; column 4, lines 40-46).

Regarding claims 9, 18 and 19, Sharma teaches that three or more diffusers may be stacked to issue a curtain of three or more layers (column 2, lines 60-63; column 5, lines 32-35). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide at least four compartments to the manifold in the modified apparatus of Gamble, on the basis of suitability for the intended use (e.g., for issuing a curtain of four or more layers). In addition, the duplication of part was held to have been obvious. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Beemis Co. Inc.* 193 USPQ 8, 11 (1977); *In re Harza* 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). In the case of the apparatus having at least four compartments, the apparatus would thus comprise at least four gas inlets (i.e., similar to gas inlets **18** and **24**; see FIG. 1), wherein each of said gas inlets comprises a valve (i.e., similar to the means **19** and **25** for controlling the fluid flow; see FIG. 1).

Regarding claim 10, Gamble discloses said chamber **104** has vertical symmetry (i.e.,

being that the chamber 104 comprises a square cross-section; see FIG. 9, 10).

Regarding claims 12 and 13, Gamble discloses a controller for controlling the movement of said mechanism for moving said support 20 (i.e., positioning system 30 comprises an X-Y stepper stage 108 and a rotational stepper 110, driven by stepping motors 112a and 112b; column 8, line 52 to column 9, line 34; FIG. 9), wherein said mechanism is a robotic arm (i.e., the rotating support rod 106, with substrate holder 22).

Regarding claim 20, it appears that the modified apparatus of Gamble structurally meets the claims, as the pressure at which the gas is introduced through the manifold is considered a process limitation, and the structural design of the gas inlets appears no different from the gas inlets as disclosed by Applicants. Thus, the gas inlets in the modified apparatus of Gamble would be inherently capable of supplying the gas at the desired pressures.

#### *Response to Arguments*

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 and 40-62 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, necessitated by amendment.

#### *Conclusion*

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 1764

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


\* \* \*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer A. Leung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1449. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:30 pm M-F, every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn A. Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jennifer A. Leung

November 12, 2005 



**HIEN TRAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**